UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,628	03/23/2004	Prashant Modi	200312794-1	2628

22879 7590 01/02/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
RUSSELL, WANDA Z	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/806,628	MODI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wanda Z. Russell	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. **Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 13-17, 28, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In claim 1, the claimed "logic" is non-statutory subject matter since it is not a process, machine, manufacture nor composition of matter; nor it is recorded on some computer-readable medium, see MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(1).

All other claims listed above have the similar problem.

The examiner suggests removal of the terminology of "logic".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. **Claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-18, 23-30, and 37-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elzur et al. (Pub No. US 2004/0093411 A1).

For **claim 1**, Elzur et al. teach a system (Fig. 6), comprising:

an interface logic (SCSI, [0043], line 1) configured to pre-configure a topology of nodes (iSCSI and computer CPU, Fig. 6, and [0041], line 5) to communicate via a preferred networking protocol (TCP-Fig. 6, and [0038], lines 8-9);

a mapping logic (SCSI CDB, [0043], lines 1-3) operably connected to the interface logic, the mapping logic being configured to produce a mapping (context for a connection, [0043], line 2) between a resource located on a first node and a port located on the first node (computer-Fig. 6), to selectively provide to a second node (storage-Fig.

6) a mapping data (context for a connection, [0043], line 2) that describes the mapping, and to selectively establish a connection that facilitates the second node accessing the resource through the port ([0041], 4th line from the end) using the preferred networking protocol (Fig. 6); and

a connection management logic (CNC, Fig. 7; [0024], line 2; and [0040], lines 1-7) operably connected to the mapping logic and the interface logic (Fig. 7), the connection management logic being configured to control whether the mapping logic will provide the mapping data and establish the connection ([0040], lines 1-7).

For **claim 2**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where to pre-configure the topology of nodes the interface logic acquires a node identifier (SCSI CDB, and context for a connection, [0043], lines 1-3) that facilitates recording whether a node is a member of a pre-configured topology, acquires a topology configuration choice data concerning how the pre-configured topology is to be configured, pre-configures the topology based, at least in part, on the node identifier and the topology configuration choice data, and provides a topology data concerning the topology to a member of the topology ([0041], lines 5-7).

For **claim 3**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 2, where the connection management logic exerts its control based, at least in part, on the topology data and a node identifier received from the second node (computer to storage –Fig. 6, and [0043], lines 12-13).

For **claim 7**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 2, where the topology data describes one or more of, which nodes are members of the topology, a preferred

computer networking protocol to be employed between members of the topology, a preferred path to be employed for communications between members of the topology, a fallback networking protocol to be employed between members of the topology, and a fallback path to be employed for communications between members of the topology (Fig. 6).

For **claim 8**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where the interface logic is further configured to control one or more resource control actions including, enabling a protocol off-load capability, aging off-loaded connections, converting idle connections to a non-off-load mode, and converting connections between an RDMA and a non-RDMA mode (Fig. 11, and [0028], line 2; and Fig. 9).

For **claim 9**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where the mapping logic comprises a port mapper configured to listen on a well-known port for one or more of, a request for mapping data, and a connection request (Fig. 6, and [0043], line 2).

For **claim 12**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where the resource supports one or more of, remote direct memory access (RDMA) (Fig. 9) between the first node and the second node, and protocol off-loading ([0028], line 2) at the first node.

For **claim 13**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where one or more of, the interface logic, the mapping logic, and the connection management logic are located on one or more of, a network interface card (NIC) (Fig. 10), and a remote direct memory access (RDMA) NIC (RNIC) (Fig. 9).

For **claim 14**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 2, where the connection management logic exerts its control based on analyzing the topology data and one or

more of, time of day, network traffic, load, and resource availability (computer to storage –Fig. 6, and [0043], lines 12-13).

For **claim 15**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 1, where the connection management logic operates at a session layer associated with the first networking protocol (TCP-IP, [0033], line 7).

For **claim 16**, Elzur et al. teach the system of claim 15, where the first networking protocol includes a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) transport layer and an Internet Protocol (IP) network layer (TCP-IP, [0033], line 7).

For **claim 17**, Elzur et al. substantially teach a computer (Fig. 6) configured with a pre-configured topology connection management system, the system comprising:

an interface logic (SCSI, [0043], line 1) configured to pre-configure a topology of nodes (iSCSI and computer CPU, Fig. 6, and [0041], line 5) to communicate via a preferred networking protocol (TCP-Fig. 6, and [0038], lines 8-9) or a fallback networking protocol, where to pre-configure the topology of nodes the interface logic acquires a node identifier that facilitates recording whether a node is a member of a pre-configured topology, acquires a topology configuration choice data concerning how the pre-configured topology is to be configured, pre-configures the topology based, at least in part, on the node identifier and the topology configuration choice data, and provides a topology data concerning the topology to a member of the topology;

a mapping logic (SCSI CDB, [0043], lines 1-3) operably connected to the interface logic, the mapping logic being configured to produce a mapping (context for a connection, [0043], line 2) between a resource located on a first node and a port located

on the first node, to selectively provide to a second node (storage-Fig. 6) a mapping data that describes the mapping between the resource and the port, and to selectively establish a connection between the first node and the second node, where the connection facilitates the second node accessing the resource through the port using the preferred networking protocol (Fig. 6); and

a connection management logic (CNC, Fig. 7; [0024], line 2; and [0040], lines 1-7) operably connected to the mapping logic and the interface logic (Fig. 7), the connection management logic being configured to control whether the mapping logic will provide the mapping data to the second node, and whether the mapping logic will establish the connection ([0040], lines 1-7), where the connection management logic exerts its control based, at least in part, on the topology data and a node identifier received from the second node.

For **claim 18**, Elzur et al. teach a method (Title), comprising:

acquiring (Fig. 7) a set of node identifiers (SCSI CDB, [0043], lines 1-3) associated with nodes to be considered for inclusion in a pre-configured topology of nodes (Fig. 6 and 7) that can communicate within the topology using a preferred computer networking protocol (TCP-Fig. 6);

establishing the pre-configured topology of nodes (Fig. 6 and 7); and

making (Fig. 6) available a membership data (data center, [0023], line 2) concerning the pre-configured topology of nodes.

For **claim 23**, Elzur et al. teach a method (Title), comprising:

acquiring (Fig. 7) a set of node identifiers (SCSI CDB, [0043], lines 1-3) associated with nodes to be considered for inclusion in a pre-configured topology of nodes (Fig. 6 and 7) that can communicate within the topology using a preferred computer networking protocol (TCP-Fig. 6);

establishing the pre-configured topology of nodes (Fig. 6 and 7);

distributing ([0075], line 4) a membership data (data center, [0023], line 2) concerning the pre-configured topology of nodes to nodes that are in the pre-configured topology of nodes (Fig. 6 and 7);

selectively adding or deleting ([0075], line 4. It is inherent that a computer system can add or delete a node form the pre-configured topology of nodes and redistribute the membership data) a node from the pre-configured topology of nodes and redistributing the membership data, in response to selectively adding or deleting the node, redistributing the membership data; and

selectively managing ([0075], line 4. It is inherent that a computer system can manage the network resource and redistribute the membership data) a computer networking resource, and in response to selectively managing the computer networking resource, redistributing the membership data.

For **claim 24**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 4, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 25**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 1 and 6, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 26**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 8, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 27**, Elzur et al. teach a method (Title), comprising:

in a first node, receiving from a second node (computer and storage connection–Fig. 6, and [0043], lines 12-13), via an open computer networking protocol (TCP-Fig. 6), a request to establish a connection between the first node and the second node via the open computer networking protocol, where the connection facilitates the second node accessing a resource associated with the first node (CNC, [0024], line 2);

determining ([0043], lines 1-5) whether the second node is a member of a pre-configured topology that includes the first node by examining a node identifier associated with the second node; and

selectively not establishing ([0040], lines 1-7) the connection between the first node and the second node via the open computer networking protocol if it is determined that the second node is not a member of the pre-configured topology that includes the first node.

For **claim 28**, Elzur et al. teach the method of claim 27, where the method is performed by a session layer logic associated with the open computer networking protocol (TCP-IP, [0033], line 7).

For **claim 29**, Elzur et al. teach the method of claim 27, where the open computer networking protocol includes a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) transport layer and an Internet Protocol (IP) network layer (TCP-IP, [0033], line 7).

For **claim 30**, it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to method claim 27-29, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 37**, it is a means claim corresponding to method claim 27, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 38**, it is a programming interfaces embodied on a computer-readable medium claim corresponding to method claim 27 or 37, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. **Claims 4-6, 10, 19-22, and 31-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elzur et al. (Pub No. US 2004/0093411 A1), in view of Delany et al. (U.S. Patent 6,658,454 B1).

For **claim 4**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1 and 2). In addition, Elzur et al. teach The system of claim 2, where a node identifier comprises one or more of, an Internet Protocol (IP) address ([0033], line 8), a value stored in one or more of a network interface card (NIC) ([0011], line 10) hardware, firmware, and software ([0006], lines 18-19), a value stored in one or more of a remote direct memory access (RDMA) (Fig. 9) NIC (RNIC) ([0052], line 1) hardware, firmware, and software, and a password.

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach a value stored on a universal serial bus (USB) token.

Delany et al. teach a value stored on a universal serial bus (USB) token (col. 7, line 47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for an alternative and conventional storage medium.

For **claim 5**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach a graphical user interface (GUI) system.

Delany et al. teach a graphical user interface (GUI) (col. 8, line 29) system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for receiving user commands and data in a graphical fashion.

For **claim 6**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1 and 2).

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach the system of claim 2, where to pre-configure the topology of nodes, the interface logic determines which nodes are members of the topology, establishes a preferred computer networking protocol to be employed by members of the topology, establishes a preferred path to be employed for data communications between members of the topology, establishes a fallback networking protocol to be employed by members of the topology, and establishes a fallback path to be employed for communications between members of the topology.

Delany et al. teach the system of claim 2, where to pre-configure the topology of nodes, the interface logic determines which nodes are members of the topology, establishes a preferred computer networking protocol to be employed by members of the topology, establishes a preferred path to be employed for data communications between members of the topology, establishes a fallback networking protocol (Abstract, line 18) to be employed by members of the topology; and establishes a fallback path to be employed for communications between members of the topology (col. 15, lines 28-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for further control of data communications.

For **claim 10**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach the system of claim 1, the mapping logic being further configured to facilitate establishing a fallback connection between the first node and the second node according to a second networking protocol, the second networking protocol being different from the first networking protocol, where the second node may request the fallback connection after the mapping logic has been controlled to not provide the mapping data to the second node or the mapping logic has been controlled to prevent the establishment of a connection between the first node and the second node using the first networking protocol.

Delany et al. teach the system of claim 1, the mapping logic being further configured to facilitate establishing a fallback connection between the first node and the second node according to a second networking protocol, the second networking protocol being different from the first networking protocol, where the second node may request the fallback connection (fallback MTA, Abstract, line 18) after the mapping logic has been controlled to not provide the mapping data to the second node or the mapping logic has been controlled to prevent the establishment of a connection between the first node and the second node using the first networking protocol (col. 11, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for further control of data communications.

For **claim 19**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 18).

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach the method of claim 18, where the set of node identifiers are acquired from one or more of, a human user through a graphical user interface (GUI), a scripting-based system, and a policy-based system.

Delany et al. teach a graphical user interface (GUI) (col. 8, line 29) system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for receiving user commands and data in a graphical fashion.

For **claim 20**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 18 and 19). In addition, Elzur et al. teach The system of claim 2, where a

node identifier comprises one or more of, an Internet Protocol (IP) address ([0033], line 8), a value stored in one or more of a network interface card (NIC) ([0011], line 10) hardware, firmware, and software ([0006], lines 18-19), a value stored in one or more of a remote direct memory access (RDMA) (Fig. 9) NIC (RNIC) ([0052], line 1) hardware, firmware, and software, and a password.

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach a value stored on a universal serial bus (USB) token.

Delany et al. teach a value stored on a universal serial bus (USB) token (col. 7, line 47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for an alternative and conventional storage medium.

For **claim 21**, Elzur et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 18). In addition, Elzur et al. teach

determining (data center, [0023], line 2) node membership in the pre-configured topology;

establishing (TCP-Fig. 6) a preferred computer networking protocol to be employed by members of the topology;

establishing (data center, [0023], line 2) a preferred path to be employed for communications between members of the topology; and

recording (CDB, [0043], line 2) the topology membership, preferred computer networking protocol, and preferred path (it is inherent that the recording process can

record any data including fallback computer networking protocol, and fallback path in the membership data).

However, Elzur et al. fail to specifically teach establishing a fallback path to be employed for communications between members of the topology; and recording the topology membership, preferred computer networking protocol, preferred path, fallback computer networking protocol, and fallback path in the membership data.

Delany et al. teach establishing a fallback path to be employed for communications between members of the topology (col. 15, lines 28-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. to obtain the invention as specified, for failure analysis and more reliable data delivery.

For **claim 22**, it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to method claim 18 and 21, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 31**, it is a method claim corresponding to method claim 1 and 10, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 32**, it is a method claim corresponding to method claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 33**, it is a method claim corresponding to method claim 4, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 34**, it is a method claim corresponding to method claim 4, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 35**, it is a method claim corresponding to method claim 16, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 36**, it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to method claim 31, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

5. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elzur et al. (Pub No. US 2004/0093411 A1), in view of Delany et al. (U.S. Patent 6,658,454 B1), and Wright et al. (Pub No. US 2005/0154825 A1).

Elzur et al. and Delany et al. substantially teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1 and 10). However, they fail to specifically teach the connection management logic being configured to block access to a first resource on the first node via the preferred networking protocol and to permit access to a second resource on the first node via a fallback networking protocol.

Fair teaches the connection management logic being configured to block access ([0042], line 11, and [0045]) to a first resource on the first node via the preferred networking protocol and to permit access to a second resource on the first node via a fallback networking protocol.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Elzur et al. with Delany et al. and Fair to obtain the invention as specified, for more reliable data delivery.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed November 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. The major matter applicant argues is that Elzur says nothing about pre-configuring a topology of nodes to communicate via a preferred network protocol.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The term "pre-configuring a topology of nodes" applicant uses is just a computer network with associated devices such as disk. Fig. 6 of Elzur teaches exactly the "topology". Computers have been used for decades and it is inherent that the interface (e.g., SCSI or iSCSI) is configured to work with the processor of the computer to configure all or some of the associated devices.

8. Applicant argues that the CDB of Elzur does not teach mapping.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In [0043] of Elzur, it states "During transmission, the host may get the SCSI CDB and the iSCSI context for a connection". It is clear that the SCSI CDB works with the processor of the computer to establish the connection that is "mapping".

9. Applicant argues that Fig. 6 and the CDB of Elzur merely describe an iSCSI that may provide control and data transfer functions, but not selective connection establishment over a preferred protocol.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

At multiple places of Elzur, applicant can find the following statements: "iSCSI protocol which relies on TCP as the transport" ([0033], lines 9-10); "iSCSI on TCP,

iSCSI on RDMA, and RDMA" ([0038], lines 8-9); and "An iSCSI session might include multiple TCP connections" ([0041], lines 7-8).

10. Applicant argues that the CNC does not control whether the mapping logic will provide mapping data and/or establish a connection.

CNC is another device that works with the iSCSI and the processor of the computer to establish the connection. It is also described in more details in [0040] along with Fig. 7.

11. Applicant addresses individual claims. Here are responses to them respectively.

Claim 1: see Sections 5-8 above.

Claim 2 and 7: see Section 5 above.

Claim 8: claim 8 does not describe RNIC, only RDMA. To address the issue applicant argues, it is inherent that all the devices, e.g., the RNIC and RDMA, work with the processor of the computer. That's why the CPU is "central" processing unit.

Claim 14: all the devices work with the processor of the computer to analyze the topology data.

Claim 17, 18, and 23: see Sections 5-8 above.

Claims 25: see Section 7 above, and Sections 5-8.

Claim 26: it is a method claim corresponding to claim 8, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 27: see Sections 5-8 above.

Claim 30: it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to claims 27-29, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 37: it is a means claim corresponding to claims 27, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 38: it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to claims 27 & 37, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 4-6: see Sections 5-8 above. As to the matter "node identifier stored on a USB token", it is obvious that when the USB is invented, one important application of it is storing files on a token through USB. As to the matter "fallback protocols and paths", it is obvious that when fallback happens, it is processed with some protocol. In col. 15, lines 28-30 of Delany, it is clearly stated what the fallback MTA does, as stated in the first office action.

Claim 10: see Section 7 above.

Claim 19: see Sections 5-8 above.

Claim 20: see Sections 5-8 above. As to the matter "node identifier stored on a USB token", it is obvious that when the USB is invented, one important application of it is storing files on a token through USB.

Claim 21 and 22: see Sections 5-8 above.

Claim 31: it is a method claim corresponding to claim 1 and 10, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 32: it is a method claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim 36: it is a computer-readable medium storing processor executable instructions claim corresponding to claim 31, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

12. A new ground(s) of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is added, therefore the rejection is non-final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wanda Z. Russell whose telephone number is (571) 270-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WZR

Seema S. Rao 12/20/07
SEEMA S. RAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600